



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,789	06/27/2003	Surendra N. Naidoo	4017-02805	6492

30652 7590 11/28/2005
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
5700 GRANITE PARKWAY, SUITE 330
PLANO, TX 75024

EXAMINER

RAMAKRISHNAIAH, MELUR

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2643

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nabavi (GB 2325548) in view of Nadooshan (US PAT: 6,161,182), Serbinis et al. (US PAT: 6,314,425, hereinafter Serbinis) and Katz (US PAT: 5,412,708).

Regarding claim 26, Nabavi discloses a method for remote monitoring of a premises, and method comprising: operatively coupling the remote client (9, fig. 1) to a security system server (10, fig. 1), the security system server authenticating a user of the remote client, operatively coupling the remote client to a security gateway (reads on 1, fig. 1), the security gateway being capable of managing the monitoring one or more portions of the premises, transferring information between the security gateway and the remote client, wherein the user is at a location which is geographically remote from the premises (figs. 1-3, page 6, line 3 to page 7, line 22).

Nabavi differs from claim 28 in that he does not teach the following: transmitting an access token from the security system server to the remote client, providing the security gateway with information about the user and access token, wherein access token is adapted to allow the remote client to access the security gateway based on the user's permission profile, wherein the user's permission profile is created by a general administrator of the security gateway, wherein access token expires at a designated

Art Unit: 2643

and date, activating a signal at the premises for notifying at the premises that remote monitoring is occurring.

However, Nadooshan teaches the following: transmitting an access token from the security system server to the remote client, providing the security gateway with information about the user and access token, wherein access token is adapted to allow the remote client to access the security gateway based on the user's permission profile (figs. 1, 9, col. 2 lines 30-48; col. 3, line 66 – col. 4, line 31; col. 7, line 48 – col. 8, line 14), wherein the user's permission profile is created by a general administrator of the security gateway (this is implied in as much as the computer systems have an administrator to set up user profiles who use computer system and its related equipment); Serbinis teaches the following: access token expires at a designated time and date (col. 21 lines 19-26); and Katz teaches the following: activating a signal at the premises for notifying at the premises that remote monitoring is occurring (col. 10 lines 46-59).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Nabavi's system to provide for the following: transmitting an access token from the security system server to the remote client, providing the security gateway with information about the user and access token, wherein access token is adapted to allow the remote client to access the security gateway based on the user's permission profile, wherein the user's permission profile is created by a general administrator of the security gateway, when access token expires at a designated time and date as this arrangement would provide means for centralized control of security

Art Unit: 2643


access to the remote premises, thereby enabling central control of all access to remote systems as taught by Nadooshan and Serbinis; activating a signal at the premises for notifying at the premises that remote monitoring is occurring as this arrangement would provide initial notification to the affected users who are being video recorded so that any privacy concerns are addressed before commencement of recording as taught by Katz.

Regarding claims 27-28, they are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the rejection of claim 26.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melur Ramakrishnaiah whose telephone number is (571)272-8098. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 Hr schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curt Kuntz can be reached on (571) 272-7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Melur Ramakrishnaiah
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2643